LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
AUG 5 1961
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961.

No. 291.

CECIL DUNLAP and SAM POLLOCK,
Petitioners,

v.

THEODORE SPILKA,
Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
To the Supreme Court of Ohio.

JOSEPH E. FINLEY,
METZENBAUM, GAINES, SCHWARTZ,
KRUPANSKY, FINLEY AND STERN,
700 Union Commerce Building,
Cleveland, Ohio,

MORTIMER RIEMER,
SMOOT AND RIEMER,
2141 Illuminating Building,
Cleveland, Ohio,
Attorneys for Petitioners.

THE GATES LEGAL PUBLISHING CO., CLEVELAND, OHIO—MAIN 1-5647

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Opinions Below 1

Statement of Jurisdiction 1

Questions Presented 2

Constitutional Provision Involved 2

Statement of the Case 2

How the Federal Questions Were Presented 8

Reasons for Granting the Writ 9

The Importance of the Questions Involved Concerning Proper Due Process Standards for State Courts in Labor Injunction Contempt Cases Make It Imperative That This Writ Be Granted 9

(a) The Widespread Use of Injunctions in Labor Disputes in State Courts 9

(b) The Sweeping Scope of the State Restraining Orders 15

(c) Contempt Is a Frequent Proceeding in State Courts in Labor Injunction Cases 16

(d) The Applicability of Due Process Standards 18

1. The Federal Requirements 18

2. The Concept of Guilt as Personal 19

3. The Rule Against Vagueness 21

(e) Unregulated State Court Action Can Impose Great Restraints Upon the National Labor Policy 22

(f) The Great National Importance of the Issues Presented Overwhelmingly Supports the Granting of the Writ 24

Conclusion ---------- 27

APPENDICES:

A. Spilka, Trustee, Appellee, v. Retail Stores Employees Union, Local No. 880, et al., Appellants 28

B. Journal Entry of the Court of Appeals ---------- 29

C. Decision of the Court of Common Pleas ---------- 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.

Cases.

Cass Farm Co. v. Detroit, 181 U. S. 396 ---------- 20

French v. Barber Asphalt Paving Co., 181 U. S. 324 ---------- 20

Garner v. Teamsters Union, 346 U. S. 485 (1953) ---------- 12

Green, In re, 172 Ohio St. 269 (1961) ---------- 13

Griffin v. Illinois, 351 U. S. 12 (1956) ---------- 14

Guss v. Utah State Labor Relations Board, 353 U. S. 1 (1957) ---------- 12

Hardin and Helber v. Kornmiller, et al., Court of Common Pleas, Hocking County, Ohio, No. 12194 11

Herndon v. Lowry, 301 U. S. 242 (1937) ---------- 20

International Longshoremen's Association v. Weaver, Court of Common Pleas, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, No. 749091 ---------- 11

Jordan v. DeGeorge, 341 U. S. 223 (1951) ---------- 20

Lamson Brothers Co. v. Retail Clerks Locals 128 and 633, Court of Common Pleas, Lucas County, Ohio, No. 184720 ---------- 11

Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U. S. 451 (1939) ---------- 20

LaSalle's, a Division of R. H. Macy & Co. v. Retail Clerks Locals 128 and 633, Court of Common Pleas, Lucas County, Ohio, No. 184121 ---------- 11

Lederer Terminal Warehouse, Inc. v. International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, AFL-CIO, Court of Common Pleas, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, No. 708768 ---- 11

Liberal Market, Inc. v. Retail Clerks Local 1552, Court of Common Pleas, Montgomery County, Ohio, No. 118394 ---- 11, 17

Milkwagon Drivers Union v. Meadowmoor Dairies, 312 U. S. 287 ---- 25, 26

San Diego Building Trades Council v. Garmon, 359 U. S. 236 (1959) ---- 12, 22

Scales v. United States, 81 Sup. Ct. 1469 (1961) ---- 19, 20

Scull v. Virginia, 359 U. S. 344 (1959) ---- 21

Smith v. International Longshoremen's Association, Local No. 1317, Court of Common Pleas, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, No. 738780 ---- 11

State v. Local Union 5760, United Steel Workers, 172 Ohio St. 75 (1961) ---- 20

Swift & Co. v. United States, 196 U. S. 375 (1905) ---- 21

Tonawanda v. Lyon, 181 U. S. 389 ---- 20

United Brotherhood of Carpenters v. United States, 330 U. S. 395 ---- 18

Wisconsin Board v. United Auto Workers, 36 L. R. R. M. 2556 (Wis. Cir. Ct., 1955) ---- 23

Youngdahl v. Rainfair, Inc., 355 U. S. 131 ---- 15, 22

172 Ohio State 341 ---- 1

Texts.

Brissenden, *The Labor Injunction in Hawaii* 48 (1956) 13

"*Criminal Responsibility for Acts of Another*," 43 Harv. L. Rev. 689, 717 ---- 19

Frankfurter and Greene, *The Labor Injunction*, 79-80 (1930) ---- 14

Frankfurter and Greene, *The Labor Injunction*, 86-89 (1930) ---- 15

Frankfurter and Greene, *The Labor Injunction*, Ch. III ---- 18

Hopson, *Kansas Labor Law and District Court Injunctions*, 6 Kan. L. Rev. 1, 33-34 (1957) ---- 13

Labor Relations Reference Manual (Bureau of National Affairs, Washington) ---- 10, 16

45 LRRM *et seq.* ---- 11, 16

46 LRRM *et seq.* ---- 11, 16

47 LRRM *et seq.* ---- 11, 16

Seidenberg, *The Labor Injunction in New York City, 1935-1950*, 17 (1953) ---- 13

Seidenberg, *The Labor Injunction in New York City, 1935-1950*, p. 24 (1953) ---- 16

Seidenberg, *The Labor Injunction in New York City, 1935-1950*, 139, 146 (1953) ---- 15

State Court Injunctions, p. 5 ---- 11

State Court Injunctions, p. 17, and Table XI, p. 28 ---- 16

State Court Injunctions, p. 40 ---- 10

State Court Injunctions, p. 43 ---- 12

State Court Injunctions, p. 46 ---- 13

State Court Injunctions, p. 49 ---- 16

State Court Injunctions, p. 62 ---- 10

State Court Injunctions, pp. 94, 108 ---- 10

State Court Injunctions, pp. 94-5 ---- 11

State Court Injunctions, p. 100 ---- 12

State Court Injunctions, p. 101 ---- 16

Constitution of the United States.

Fourteenth Amendment 2, 9, 20, 21

Statutes.

Norris LaGuardia Act, Section 6 18

28 U. S. C. Sec. 1257(3) 1

29 U. S. C. Sec. 106, 41 Stat. 71 18

29 U. S. C. Secs. 157, 158, 159 22

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961.

No. _____.

CECIL DUNLAP and SAM POLLOCK,

Petitioners,

v.

THEODORE SPILKA,
Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
To the Supreme Court of Ohio.

OPINIONS BELOW.

There was no opinion on the merits rendered by the Supreme Court of Ohio. That Court's dismissal of the appeal involved and refusal to certify the record is reported at 172 Ohio State 341, and is set forth in full in Appendix A hereto.

There was no reported opinion by the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County, Eighth Appellate District. That court's order is set forth in full in Appendix B hereto.

There was no reported opinion of the Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County. That court's oral decision is set forth in full in Appendix C hereto.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.

The order of the Supreme Court of Ohio was entered on May 10, 1961. There was no motion made for rehearing.

Jurisdiction of this Court is based upon 28 U. S. C. Sec. 1257 (3).